

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/825,168	DALIDOWITZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey Sharp	3677

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeffrey Sharp. (3) Joey Yao.

(2) Robert Sandy. (4) Tim BRACKETT

Date of Interview: 11/16/2005

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: claims of record, primarily claim 27.

Identification of prior art discussed: prior art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

ROBERT J. SANDY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed zinc plating thickness limitation and textured head limitation. Applicant's clearly outlined their argument that the Hyner reference allegedly does not teach a zinc layer directly applied to the carbon steel fastener, and that the Perkins reference allegedly would not suggest a texture applied to the head of a fastener for the intended purpose of facilitating electrodeposition. The Office maintained that the prior art references of record, when construed broadly, sufficiently teach each and every limitation of claim 27.